arXiv:1212.4763v1 [math.QA] 19 Dec 2012

Centers, cocenters and simple quantum groups

Alexandru Chirvasitu[*]

December 20, 2012

Abstract

We define the notion of center for a linearly reductive quantum group, and show that the quotient of a such a quantum group by its center is simple whenever its fusion semiring is free in the sense of Banica and Vergnioux. We also prove that the same is true of free products of quantum groups under very mild non-degeneracy conditions. Several natural families of compact quantum groups, some with non-commutative fusion semirings and hence very "far from classical", are thus seen to be simple.

Keywords: cosemisimple Hopf algebra, CQG algebra, simple compact quantum group, normal quantum subgroup, cocenter

Contents

1 Preliminaries **2**
1.1 Free fusion semirings 4
1.2 Normal quantum subgroups 6

2 Centers and cocenters **7**

3 Simple cocenters **10**

4 Projective simplicity of free products **12**

References **15**

Introduction

Quantum groups of function algebra type, in the spirit of, say, [27, 18, 22], appear naturally as Hopf algebras coacting universally on various structures (such as a vector space endowed with an R-matrix in the case of [22], for example, or a quadratic algebra in [18]). The point of view adopted in this paper is that of the sources just cited (and dual to that of e.g. [15, 12]): Hopf algebras are regarded as algebras of (appropriately nice) functions on fictitious objects referred to as quantum groups. In fact, the only Hopf algebras we consider here are cosemisimple, in the sense that their categories of comodules (to be regarded as representations of the underlying quantum group) are semisimple; the phrase 'linearly reductive' in the abstract refers to this semisimplicity property, by analogy with the use of the term 'linearly reductive' in the context of algebraic groups. For

---

[*] University of California at Berkeley, chirvasitua@math.berkeley.edu

compilations of references available at the time and overviews of the subject the reader can consult, for example, [7, §7] or [16, §9].

The theory of compact quantum groups initiated by Woronowicz in [27] (in non-quite-final form in this early paper) has led to the discovery of numerous examples that do not arise as deformed function algebras of ordinary Lie groups, and to an explosion in the field. For a survey of the (already vast, at the time) literature we refer to [28, 17]. We are interested here in the purely algebraic counterpart of Woronowicz's C^*-algebraic notion of a compact quantum group, i.e. in the so-called CQG algebras of [11] (see Section 1).

In the course of trying to push analogies to ordinary compact groups as far as possible, one might be led quite naturally to ask what a *simple* compact (or more generaly, linearly reductive) quantum group is. The notion was introduced in [26], where Wang also shows that some of the well-known examples in the literature are simple (e.g. deformed function algebras of simple compact Lie groups). One problem posed in [26] is to provide examples of simple compact quantum groups with non-commutative fusion ring (i.e. Grothendieck ring of the category of comodules; see Section 1 for terminology); this is addressed in [9], where it is shown that free unitary groups, which are to compact quantum groups what ordinary unitary groups are to compact Lie groups, become simple once we quotient out a one-dimensional central torus (see [9, Theorem 1], and below).

The present paper is in a sense a sequel to [9], and is concerned with extending the earlier results to a wider class of linearly reductive quantum groups. It is organized as follows:

Section 1 is devoted to the preparations needed afterwards. We fix some notations, recall some reoccuring specific examples of compact quantum groups, review useful notions such as that of free fusion semiring, etc.

In Section 2 we ntroduce the notion of center for a linearly reductive quantum group. The idea is simple enough, and is based on the representation-theoretic characterization of the center of a compact Lie group (e.g. [20]). We also introduce the quotient of a quantum group by its center, referring to it as the cocenter (2.0.11). The main result of the section is Proposition 2.0.12, which gives a convenient description of the cocenter and will come up again and again in later sections.

The first main result of the paper is Theorem 3.0.14, which says that cocenters of quantum groups with free fusion semirings in the sense of [5] are simple. This generalizes [9, Theorem 1], and provides new examples of simple quantum groups, arising naturally as cocenters.

Finally, in Section 4 we study free products of quantum groups in the sense of [24] (i.e. quantum groups corresponding to coproducts of families of Hopf algebras; see below for details). The main results are Theorem 4.0.20, which says that the center construction preserves free products, and Theorem 4.0.23, stating that a free product of at least two non-trivial linearly reductive quantum groups has simple cocenter. This provides even more examples of simple quantum groups with highly non-commutative fusion semirings, as well as a systematic way of obtaining such examples.

The proofs are elementary, in that they consist of little more than word combinatorics carried out in fusion semirings.

1 Preliminaries

Although on occasion we specialize the discussion to compact quantum groups and hence complex Hopf $*$-algebras, the main characters throughout are cosemisimple Hopf algebras over some algebraically closed field k (possibly of positive characteristic). Comodules are right and finite-dimensional unless specified otherwise, and the category of C-comodules is denoted by $\mathcal{M}^C$. The notaton pertaining to Hopf algebra or coalgebra theory is standard: Δ, ε and S for comultiplications, counits and antipodes respectively (maybe with indices, as in Δ_C for the comultiplication of the coalgebra C), and Sweedler notation minus the summation sign for comultiplications and comodule structures, i.e. $\Delta(x) = x_1 \otimes x_2$ and $v \mapsto v_0 \otimes v_1$ respectively. For all of this and other background on Hopf algebras or coalgebras we refer to [10, 19].

All coalgebras anywhere in this paper are, as mentioned before, *cosemisimple*, in the sense that their categories of comodules are semisimple. Since we are working over algebraically closed fields, this is the same as saying that the coalgebra is a direct sum of matrix coalgebras, i.e. duals of matrix algebras $M_n(k)$. To any C-comodule V we associate the *coefficient subcoalgebra* $C_V \leq C$ defined as the smallest subcoalgebra such that the comodule structure map $V \to V \otimes C$ factors through $V \otimes C_V$. This implements a bijection between (isomorphism classes of) simple C-comodules and matrix coalgebra summands of C. Moreover, if C happens to be a Hopf algebra, the correspondence further agrees with the rest of the structure: $C_{V\otimes W}$ is exactly the product $C_V C_W$, while $C_{V^*} = S(C_V)$. We write $\widehat{C}$ for the set of isomorpism classes of simple comodules.

One particularly nice way of being cosemisimple is to be a *CQG algebra*. We recall here only that these are complex Hopf $*$-algebras (i.e. '$*$' is an antilinear, multiplication-reversing involution so that both Δ and ε are $*$-algebra maps) with the aditional property that all H-comodules admit an inner product invariant under H in some sense (which we will not need to make precise below). The idea is that such objects should behave like algebras of representative functions on a compact group, and the inner product condition mimics the existence of an invariant inner product for any finite-dimensional complex representation of a compact group. We refer to [11], where the notion first appeared, or alternatively to [16, §11], for all of the necessary background. As far as this paper is concerned, CQG algebras enter the picture by virtue of being cosemisimple Hopf algebras.

By 'quantum group' (sometimes, for clarity, 'linearly reductive quantum group') we mean the object dual to a cosemisimple Hopf algebra. When the latter is a CQG algebra, we might call the dual object a 'compact quantum group', as is customary in the literature.

One notion that will play an important role is that of *fusion semiring* $R_+(H)$ for a Hopf algebra H. This is simply the Grothendieck semiring of its category of comodules, and is a free abelian monoid on a set $\{r_V\}$ indexed by the simple H-comodules V. It has a natural multiplication-reversing involution $x \mapsto x^*$ induced by taking duals at the catgorical level (the fact that '$*$' is an involution follows from cosemisimplicity). We will often blur the line between a comodule and its class in the fusion semiring, and may write for instance C_x for C_V if $x \in R_+(H)$ is the class of the H-comodule V, may omit tensor products between comodules as in VW instead of $V \otimes W$, etc. We will on occasion also refer to the fusion ring $R(H)$ of H: It is the Grothendieck ring (as opposed to the semiring) of the category of comodules. Both R and R_+ are partially ordered by making R_+ the positive cone. In other words, $x \leq y$ in $R(H)$ provided $y = x + z$ for some $z \in R_+(H)$. In R_+ this is the same as saying that the representation whose class $y \in R_+$ is can be written as a direct sum of the representations corresponding to x and z.

There is a bijective correspondence between Hopf subalgebras of a Hopf algebra H and *based* involution-invariant sub-semirings of $R_+(H)$. Here, 'based' means being the span of a set of (classes of) simple comodules; since all sub-semirings in this paper are based in this sense, we will simply drop the adjective. Indeed, to a Hopf subalgebra $K \leq H$ the (fully faithful) scalar corestriction functor on comodules induces an embedding $R_+(K) \to R_+(H)$, while in order to go in the other direction, to any (based) sub-semiring R_+ of $R_+(H)$ we can associate the direct sum of those matrix subcoalgebras of H which correspond via $V \mapsto C_V$ to simples in R_+.

As a final general remark complementing the previous paragraph, note that a Hopf subalgebra of a CQG algebra is automatically invariant under the $*$-structure, and hence the discussion above applies verbatim, without our having to worry about an additional $*$-invariance property.

1.1 Free fusion semirings

These will be particularly amenable to the kind of analysis carried out in Section 3. Before explaining what freeness is, we take a short detour to fix some notation.

We will often consider structures $(R, *, \circ)$, where R is a set, $* : R \to R$ is an involution, and $\circ : R \times R \to R \cup \{\emptyset\}$ is a map usually referred to as the fusion. Both $*$ and $\circ$ are extended to the free monoid $\langle R \rangle$ on R (thought of as the set of words on the alphabet R with juxtaposition as multiplication) by making $*$ multiplication-reversing, and by

$$(r_1 \dots r_k) \circ (s_1 \dots s_l) = r_1 \dots r_{k-1}(r_k \circ s_1)s_2 \dots s_l,\ \ r_i, s_j \in R$$

respectively. Here, the right hand side is $\emptyset$ whenever $r_k \circ s_1 = \emptyset$.

Following [5, 10.2], we have:

1.1.1 Definition The fusion semiring of a cosemisimple Hopf algebra H is said to be *free on* $(R, *, \circ)$ if there is some indexing $\langle R \rangle \ni x \mapsto a_x \in \widehat{H}$ of the set of simple comodules by $\langle R \rangle$, with the monoidal unit corresponding to the empty word and the operation of taking duals corresponding to the involution $*$ on $\langle R \rangle$, and the multiplication in $R_+(H)$ is given by

$$a_x a_y = \sum_{x=vg, y=g^*w} (a_{vw} + a_{v \circ w}). \tag{1}$$

The convention is that in the right hand side of this equality, the term $a_{v\circ w}$ is absent whenever $v \circ w = \emptyset$, and *free on* $(R, *)$ means free on $(R, *, \circ)$ with $\circ$ constantly equal to $\emptyset$.

'Free' period, unadorned by any data $(R, *, \circ)$, means that there is some such data which makes the semiring free in the sense of the previous paragraph. The same terminology applies to fusion rings. ◆

For Hopf algebras with free fusion semirings we usually identify simple comodules with words over the alphabet R, and denote the coalgebras C_{a_v} by C_v for words $v \in \langle R \rangle$.

1.1.2 Remark It will come in handy below to notice that a fusion ring free on $(R, *, \circ)$ in the sense of 1.1.1 is in fact free as a ring on the set R, i.e. it is a non-commutative polynomial ring in the variables a_r, $r \in R$. This can be shown by filtering the ring by lengths of words, and observing that (1) says that $a_x a_y = a_{xy}$ up to shorter words. The argument is spelled out in [21, 3.2].

One consequence of all of this is that a cosemisimple Hopf algebra with free fusion semiring cannot have non-trivial one-dimensional comodules, or equivalently, non-trivial grouplike elements; indeed, a one-dimensional comodule would correspond to an invertible element of the fusion ring, but the only invertibles in a non-commutative polynomial ring (over $\mathbb{Z}$) are ± 1. We need this in Section 3. ◆

Several important families of cosemisimple Hopf algebras (in fact CQG algebras) exhibit the kind of behaviour axiomatized by 1.1.1. We now recall some of these.

1.1.3 Example Let Q be a positive self-adjoint $n \times n$ matrix, and $A_u(Q)$ the $*$-algebra freely generated by the n^2 elements u_{ij}, $i, j = \overline{1, n}$, subject to the relations demanding that both $u = (u_{ij})_{i,j}$ and $Q^{\frac{1}{2}} \overline{u} Q^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ be unitary as elements of $M_n(A_u(Q))$ (where $\overline{u} = (u_{ij}^*)_{i,j}$).

$A_u(Q)$ can be made into a CQG algebra by declaring that u_{ij} are the usual n^2 basis elements of a matrix coalgebra in the sense that

$$\Delta(u_{ij}) = \sum_k u_{ik} \otimes u_{kj}, \quad \varepsilon(u_{ij}) = \delta_{ij}$$

(a theme that will come up again and again in these examples; they are all defined by imposing relations on the n^2 matrix units of an $n \times n$ matrix coalgebra).

The algebras $A_u(Q)$ were introduced by Wang and van Daele in [23], and they are the quantum analogues of unitary groups: Every finitely generated CQG algebra is a quotient of one of them, meaning, in dual language, that every "compacy quantum Lie group" embeds in the compact quantum group associated to $A_u(Q)$ for some Q.

When $n \geq 2$ (which will always be assumed), it was shown in [3] that the fusion semiring of $A_u(Q)$ is free on $(\{\alpha, \alpha^*\}, *)$, where α is the class of the fundamental representation corresponding to the matrix coalgebra spanned by u; it has a basis e_i, $i = \overline{1, n}$ and comodule structure defined by $e_j \mapsto \sum_i e_i \otimes u_{ij}$. ◆

1.1.4 Example Now let Q be a matrix with the property $Q\overline{Q} \in \mathbb{R}I_n$ (just like the positivity assumption of the previous example, this avoids some redundance and degeneracy). The CQG algebra $B_u(Q)$ was also introduced in [23] (denoted there by $A_o(Q)$) as the $*$-algebra obtained from $A_u(Q)$ by imposing the additional assumption that all u_{ij} be self-adjoint.

The fusion semiring of $B_u(Q)$ is determined in [2], and is isomorphic to that of $SU(2)$ whenever $n \geq 2$: free on $(\{\alpha\}, *)$ for the fundamental representation $\alpha = \alpha^*$ defined as in the previous example. ◆

1.1.5 Example In [25], Wang introduced the quantum automorphism group $A^{aut}(B, \tau)$ of a traced finite-dimensional C^*-algebra (B, τ), meaning the initial object in the category of CQG algebras endowed with a coaction on B that preserves the trace τ in the appropriate sense. If the trace τ is chosen judiciously, the fusion semiring of A^{aut} is isomorphic to that of $SO(3)$ (as shown in [4]). This means in particular that it is free on $(\{\alpha\}, *, \circ)$, where $\alpha = \alpha^*$ and $\alpha \circ \alpha = \alpha$. ◆

1.1.6 Example The quantum reflection groups of [5] are another important family of examples. For a positive integer n and an additional parameter s which is either a positive integer or ∞, the quantum reflection group $A_h^s(n)$ is defined as the $*$-algebra freely generated by the n^2 generators u_{ij}, satisfying the conditions:

1. u and $\overline{u}$ are unitary.
2. All u_{ij} are partial isometries, in the sense that $p_{ij} = u_{ij}u_{ij}^*$ are idempotent.
3. $u_{ij}^s = p_{ij}$.

This is motivated by the fact that imposing the additional condition of commutativity would result in the algebra of functions on the group of $n \times n$ monomial matrices (i.e. one non-zero entry in each row and column) with s'th roots of unity as non-zero entries.

In this setting (and assuming $n \geq 4$), [5, 7.3] says that the fusion semiring of $A_h^s(n)$ is free on $(\mathbb{Z}/s\mathbb{Z}, *, \circ)$, where $x^* = -x$ and $x \circ y = x + y$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}/s\mathbb{Z}$. ◆

1.1.7 Example Given a family H_i of cosemisimple Hopf algebras whose fusion semirings are free on $(R_i, *_i, \circ_i)$ for some index set $I \ni i$, their coproduct in the category of Hopf algebras is again cosemisimple, and its fusion semiring is free on $(R = \bigsqcup R_i, *, \circ)$ where this latter $*$ consists simply of putting together the involutions $*_i$ of the individual R_i's, while for $r, s \in R$, $r \circ s$ is $r \circ_i s$ if $r, s \in R_i$, and $\emptyset$ otherwise.

All of this follows for example from [24, 1.1], which basically says that the fusion semiring of the coproduct (there called the *free product* of the corresponding compact quantum groups) is the coproduct in the category of semirings of the $R_+(H_i)$. Although that paper is concerned with CQG algebras, these results extend easily to arbitrary cosemisimple Hopf algebras. ◆

1.2 Normal quantum subgroups

In the setting we are placing ourselves in, with Hopf algebras regarded as analogues of algebras of functions on groups, a normal quantum subgroup of a quantum group should correspond to a *quotient* Hopf algebra with some extra properties. We recall what these are, following [1, 26].

1.2.1 Definition A morphism $\pi : H \to K$ of Hopf algebras is *normal* if the left and right kernels of π defined respectively by

$$\mathrm{LK{\small ER}}(\pi) = \{h \in H \mid \pi(h_1) \otimes h_2 = 1_K \otimes h\}$$

and

$$\mathrm{RK{\small ER}}(\pi) = \{h \in H \mid h_1 \otimes \pi(h_2) = h \otimes 1_K\}$$

coincide.

For a quantum group (dual to the Hopf algebra) H, a *normal quantum subgroup* is a normal Hopf algebra surjection $\pi : H \to K$. The same discussion applies to CQG algebras, in which case all morphisms are always understood to be $*$-preserving. ◆

This is the definition adopted in [26, 2.1] (see also [1, 1.1.5]), and it is motivated by the fact that for Hopf algebras of representative functions on compact groups, it recovers the usual notion of normality (with the left and right kernels being algebras of functions on the right and left coset spaces respectively). Note that the map π itself is regarded as the subgroup; two maps are always taken to represent the same subgroup whenever they are isomorphic as H-sourced arrows in the category of Hopf algebras (or CQG algebras).

In the situation of 1.2.1, $P = \mathrm{LK{\small ER}}(\pi) = \mathrm{RK{\small ER}}(\pi)$ is a Hopf subalgebra of H, which can be thought of, morally, as functions on the quotient of the quantum group H by the quantum subgroup K; we denote it by $\mathrm{HK{\small ER}}(\pi)$, and refer to it as the *Hopf kernel* of π. In all cases we deal with in this paper (where all Hopf algebras are cosemisimple), $\iota : P \to H$ and $\pi : H \to K$ are the two halves of what in [1, 1.2] is called a *exact sequence* of quantum groups, and ι and π in fact determine one another (see e.g. [26, 4.4]). Moreover, the Hopf kernel $\iota : P \to H$ of $\pi : H \to K$ can be characterized in the cosemisimple case as the sum of precisely those matrix subcoalgebras of H whose corresponding simple comodules become trivial through scalar corestriction by π (meaning direct sums of the trivial one-dimensional comodule).

As it turns out, there is a simple necessary and sufficient condition which will ensure that an inclusion $\iota : P \to H$ of (cosemisimple) Hopf algebras is half of an exact sequence $P \to H \to K$: It is that P be invariant under either the left or the right adjoint action of H on itself, defined by $h \triangleright h' = h_1 h' S(h_2)$ and $h' \triangleleft h = S(h_1) h' h_2$ respectively (in which case we say that P is *ad-invariant*). Indeed, one can show easily that left (right) kernels of Hopf algebra morphisms are always invariant under the right (resp. left) adjoint action; [1, 1.2.5] ensures the opposite implication as soon as H is faithfully flat over P, which according to [8] is always the case.

In conclusion, knowledge of the ad-invariant Hopf subalgebra $\iota : P \to H$ is equivalent to giving a normal quantum subgroup $\pi : H \to K$, and we will often conflate these two points of view.

1.2.2 Remark We take a moment to observe that the (left, say) adjoint action of a matrix subcoalgebra C of a Hopf algebra H on another such subcoalgebra D is non-zero. Indeed, This follows from the fact that $H \ni 1 \in S(C)C$, and hence $D \leq S(C) \triangleright (C \triangleright D)$. We need this below. ◆

Now that we know what normal quantum subgroups are, the following is natural:

1.2.3 Definition A quantum group with underlying Hopf algebra H is *simple* if there are no normal quantum subgroups apart from the obvious ones, $\mathrm{id} : H \to H$ and $\varepsilon : H \to k$. ◆

1.2.4 Remark The original definition adopted in [26] for compact quantum groups is somewhat different: There are additional requirements that the compact quantum group (a) be what is usually called a *matrix* CQG (in dual language, this amounts to the corresponding Hopf algebra being finitely generated as an algebra), (b) be *connected* (in the context of compact quantum groups, this means essentially that every non-trivial Hopf $*$-subalgebra is infinite-dimensional), and (c) have no non-trivial irreducible one-dimensional representations (i.e. comodules for the corresponding Hopf algebra).

Conditions (b) and (c) hold automatically for the examples obtained below via Theorem 3.0.14, all of whose fusion semirings are embedded into free ones. Indeed, the free fusion rules (1) make it clear that any non-trivial Hopf subalgebra of such a Hopf algebra has infinitely many simple comodules, proving (b); on the other hand, 1.1.2 ensures that (c) holds for Hopf algebras with free fusion semirings and their Hopf subalgebras.

As pointed out in [9], the examples covered by Theorem 3.0.14 will not, in general, satisfy condition (a). Other examples that do go the extra mile can be obtained by judiciously selecting finitely generated Hopf subalgebras (e.g. as in [9, Proposition 10]), but this is somehow less natural than the cocenter construction of the next section. All of this seemed to justify choosing the shorter definition over the longer, more refined one. ♦

2 Centers and cocenters

This section is devoted to defining the notion of center for a quantum group (regarded, as always in this paper, as the object dual to a cosemisimple Hopf algebra) and providing a characterization that will come in handy in Section 3. Roughly speaking, the center is, as expected, "precisely the quantum subgroup which acts as scalars on any simple comodule". Making this precise requires a bit of unpacking.

The notion of centrality for a quantum subgroup $\pi : H \to K$ of a quantum group H is introduced in the course of the proof of [26, 4.5]:

2.0.5 Definition A morphism $\pi : H \to K$ of cosemisimple Hopf algebras is *central* if

$$(\pi \otimes \mathrm{id}) \circ \Delta_H = (\pi \otimes \mathrm{id}) \circ \tau \circ \Delta_H : H \to K \otimes H, \tag{2}$$

where τ is the usual flip of tensorands. ♦

2.0.6 Remark In particular, if $\pi : H \to K$ is a central quantum subgroup in the sense that it is central and surjective, then K is cocommutative. Its cosemisimplicity then implies that it must be a group algebra. Moreover, as noted in [26, 4.5], centrality implies normality. ♦

The following result ties in the definition with the representation-theoretic interpretation of centrality suggested in the first paragraph of this section.

2.0.7 Proposition *A morphism $\pi : H \to K$ of cosemisimple Hopf algebras is central in the sense of 2.0.5 if and only if the associated scalar corestriction functor $\mathcal{M}^H \to \mathcal{M}^K$ turns every simple H-comodule into a direct sum of copies of a single one-dimensional K-comodule.*

Proof Since linear functionals $\varphi \in K^*$ separate the elements of K, (2) can be stated as

$$\varphi(\pi(h_1))h_2 = \varphi(\pi(h_2))h_1, \ \forall h \in H, \ \varphi \in K^*. \tag{3}$$

In turn, this is equivalent to the commutativity of all diagrams of the form

$$\begin{tikzcd}
V \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varphi"'] & V\otimes H \arrow[d, "\varphi\otimes\mathrm{id}"] \\
V \arrow[r] & V\otimes H
\end{tikzcd}$$

for all choices of a comodule $V\in\mathcal{M}^H$ and a functional $\varphi\in K^*$, where the vertical maps represent the action of φ on V by $\varphi\triangleright v=\varphi(\pi(v_1))v_0$. Indeed, the right-down path in the diagram sends v to $v_0\otimes\varphi(\pi(v_1))v_2$, whereas the down-right path sends it to $v_0\otimes\varphi(\pi(v_2))v_1$.

In conclusion, the centrality of 2.0.5 is equivalent to K^* acting by H-comodule maps on all H-comodules, or equivalently (by cosemisimplicity) on all simple H-comodules. But for simple $V\in\mathcal{M}^H$, Schur's lemma makes this latter condition equivalent to K^* acting on V by $\varphi\triangleright v=\Psi(\varphi)(v)$ for some algebra homomorphism $\Psi:K^*\to k$.

Since the K^*-module structure is induced by a K-comodule structure, in the situation described above Ψ must be of the form $\varphi\mapsto\varphi(g)$ for some $g\in K$. The fact that Ψ is an algebra map translates to g being a grouplike, and hence the K-comodule V breaks up as a direct sum of $\dim V$ copies of the one-dimensional kg-comodule. ■

Now let $\pi:H\to K$ be a central quantum subgroup. According to the proposition, every simple $V\in\mathcal{M}^H$ can be written, when regarded as a K-comodule, as a direct sum of $\dim V$ copies of a K-comodule corresponding to some grouplike element $g\in K$. Moreover, the surjectivity of π means that K is in fact a group algebra $k[G]$. Labelling V by g defines a G-grading on the fusion semiring $R_+(H)$ (and also on the category $\mathcal{M}^H$).

Conversely, suppose we have a grading of $R_+(H)$ by a group G such that all simples are homogeneous. Then we can recover a central quantum subgroup $\pi:H\to k[G]$ as follows: For a simple $V\in\mathcal{M}^H$ assigned degree $g\in G$ by the grading, fix some basis $\{e_i\}$, $i=\overline{1,n}$, consider the corresponding matrix units u_{ij} determined by $(e_j)_0\otimes(e_j)_1=\sum e_i\otimes u_{ij}$, and define the restriction of π to C_V by $u_{ij}\mapsto\delta_{ij}g$. We leave to the reader the task of checking that this is a well-defined morphism of Hopf algebras (or CQG algebras, if H is a CQG algebra and $\mathbb{C}[G]$ is given its standard CQG structure making the elements of G unitary). To check independence of the choice of basis $\{e_i\}$, for example, notice that a different choice would conjugate $u=(u_{ij})\in M_n(H)$ by a scalar $n\times n$ invertible matrix, and such a conjugation fixes the matrix $(\delta_{ij}g)_{i,j}\in M_n(k[G])$ componentwise.

2.0.8 Definition Let H be a cosemisimple Hopf algebra. The *category of gradings* of $R_+(H)$ has as objects gradings of $R_+(H)$ by groups such that the simples are homogeneous, and as morphisms between a G_1 and a G_2-grading, morphisms of groups $f:G_1\to G_2$ respecting the grading, in the sense that if the simple V has degree $g_1\in G_1$ with respect to the first grading, then it has degree $f(g_1)\in G_2$ with respect to the second one.

The *category of central arrows* of H has central arrows $H\to k[G]$ as objects, and the obvious commutative triangles as morphisms. ◆

2.0.9 Remark Note that for any grading of $R_+(H)$ by a group G as in the preceding discussion, the trivial comodule automatically gets degree 1, which in turn implies that the grading intertwines the $*$ involution on $R_+(H)$ and the inverse operation $g\mapsto g^{-1}$ on G. ◆

With these preparations, the discussion preceding the definition can now be summarized as follows:

2.0.10 Proposition *For any cosemisimple Hopf algebra H, sending a central arrow $H \to k[G]$ to the grading described before 2.0.8 sets up an equivalence between central arrows of H and gradings of $R_+(H)$.* ■

It is sensible now to try to define the center of the quantum group H as the largest central quantum subgroup, meaning initial object in the category of central arrows. Proposition 2.0.10 allows us to do just that, by first observing that the category of gradings of $R_+(H)$ has an initial object. This universal grading has appeared, for example, in [6, 20, 14], sometimes in slightly different variants which can easily be adapted to the present situation.

2.0.11 Definition Let H be a cosemisimple Hopf algebra. The *center* of the corresponding quantum group is the initial object $\pi : H \to Z$ of the category of central arrows.

The *cocenter* is the Hopf kernel of the center π. ♦

Following [6, 20], we denote the group implementing the initial grading of $R_+(H)$ by $\mathcal{C}(H)$. A description analogous to that in [6] would be as the set of equivalence classes of $\widehat{H}$, where $x, y \in \widehat{H}$ are declared equivalent (written $x \sim y$) whenever $x, y \le z_1 \dots z_n$ in $R_+(H)$ for some $z_j \in \widehat{H}$. The multiplication inherited from that of $R_+(H)$ makes this set into a group, with inverse given by taking duals.

We now seek to describe the cocenter of a quantum group H in terms of its fusion semiring. The preceding discussion almost takes care of the first half of the following proposition, while the second half requires slightly more work and is needed in Section 3:

2.0.12 Proposition *Let H be a cosemisimple Hopf algebra, and $\iota : P \to H$ its cocenter. The fusion semiring $R_+(P)$ can be described as either*

(a) The sub-semiring of $R_+(H)$ spanned by those $x \in \widehat{H}$ which are majorized by some product $(z_1 \dots z_n)(z_1 \dots z_n)^* \in R_+(H)$, $z_j \in \widehat{H}$ with respect to the usual partial order, or

(b) The sub-semiring of $R_+(H)$ generated by those $x \in \widehat{H}$ which are majorized by some zz^*, $z \in \widehat{H}$.

Proof Part (a) is an immediate consequence of the discussion preceding the statement: $R_+(P) \le R_+(H)$ is spanned by those simples $x \in \widehat{H}$ which are equivalent to 1 through $\sim$, i.e. such that x and 1 are majorized by some product $z_1 \dots z_n$ for $z_j \in \widehat{H}$. This implies $x \le (z_1 \dots z_n)(z_1 \dots z_n)^*$. Conversely, the latter condition on x certainly implies $x \sim 1$, since both x and 1 are then summands of $(z_1 \dots z_n)(z_1 \dots z_n)^*$.

The sub-semiring described in part (b) is a priori smaller than that of (a), and it is our task to show that the two in fact coincide. To this end, it is enough to show that any simple

$$x \le (z_1 \dots z_n)(z_1 \dots z_n)^* = z_1 \dots z_n z_n^* \dots z_1^* \tag{4}$$

is a summand of $(z_1 \dots z_{n-1})(z_1 \dots z_{n-1})^* yy^*$ for some $y \in \widehat{H}$, for we can then use induction on n.

Consider H as a comodule over itself, via the right adjoint coaction $h \mapsto h_2 \otimes S(h_1)h_3$; more concretely, H is simply the direct sum of all $y \otimes y^*$, $y \in \widehat{H}$. A multiplicity count will quickly convince the reader that for any $z \in \widehat{H}$ (equivalently, any $z \in \mathcal{M}^H$), we have

$$z \otimes H \cong H^{\oplus \dim z} \cong H \otimes z. \tag{5}$$

To conclude, note that as a consequence of (4), x is a summand of

$$(z_1 \dots z_{n-1}) \otimes H \otimes (z_1 \dots z_{n-1})^* \;\cong\; (z_1 \dots z_{n-1}) \otimes (z_1 \dots z_{n-1})^* \otimes H,$$

where the isomorphism follows from (5) applied to $z = z_1 \dots z_{n-1}$. Finally, since x is simple, it must be a subcomodule of some summand $(z_1 \dots z_{n-1})(z_1 \dots z_{n-1})^* yy^*$ of the latter. ■

Versions of the cocentral fusion sub-semiring $R_+(P) \le R_+(H)$, described as in part (b) of Proposition 2.0.12, have appeared in [13, 14, 20]. The identification of the cocenter with this particular sub-semiring is a non-commutative analogue of the fact that in the classical case, for a compact group G, one recovers in this way precisely the fusion semiring of the quotient $G/Z(G)$ by the center (e.g. [20, 2.8]).

2.0.13 Remark The pared-down discussion in Proposition 2.0.12 is included here for the convenience of ther eader, but let us mention that a more general version holds (and is essentially available in the literature), in the sense that sub-semirings defined as in (a) and (b) coincide for any so-called *fusion category* (even after dropping the usual requirement that there be only finitely many simple objects).

Equation (5) would not be available in precisely the same form in this generality, but its two outer terms would still be equal if H is taken, as in the text, to be the direct sum of all $y \otimes y^*$ for y ranging over the simple objects. This is the gist of [14, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5] (adapted to the case of infinitely many simples), which show that the initial grading of a fusion category coincides with the decomposition of the Grothendieck semiring of the entire category into summands as a module over the sub-semiring defined as in (b). ◆

3 Simple cocenters

As announced in the introduction, the main result of this section is:

3.0.14 Theorem *For any cosemisimple Hopf algebra H whose fusion semiring is free on a datum $(R, *, \circ)$, the cocenter $\iota : P \to H$ is simple in the sense of 1.2.3.*

Proof As in §1.1, we denote the correspondence between words on R and simple H-comodules by $\langle R\rangle \ni x \mapsto a_x \in \widehat{H}$. The statement reduces to showing that the only ad-invariant Hopf subalgebras $Q \le P$ are the two obvious ones. Throughout the rest of the proof, fix such a Q, and assume it is strictly larger than the scalars. Our aim will be to show that $Q = P$.

According to part (b) of Proposition 2.0.12, it suffices to prove that $R_+(Q) \le R_+(P)$ contains $a_u a_{u^*}$ for any word u. Let $a_v \in R_+(Q)$ for some non-empty word v (if there is no such v then Q is just the constants, and there is nothing to prove). By (1), $a_{vv^*} \in R_+(Q)$. Write $vv^* = r \dots r^*$ for some $r \in R$, and consider the two possible cases:

(1) The alphabet R is of cardinality at least two. Let $w \in \langle R\rangle$ be a word ending in some letter $s \ne r^*$ (so that w^* starts with $s^* \ne r$) and such that $a_w \in R_+(P)$. The fusion rules (1) now imply that $a_w a_{vv^*} a_{w^*} = a_{wvv^*w^*}$ is simple, and hence the multiplication map $C_w \otimes C_{vv^*} \otimes C_{w^*} \mapsto C_{wvv^*w^*}$ is an isomorphism. Since $Q \le P$ is assumed to be ad-invariant, acting on $C_{vv^*} \le Q$ with $C_w \le P$ will produce an element of Q (again non-zero, by 1.2.2). It follows that the entire matrix coalgebra $C_{wvv^*w^*}$ is contained in Q, and hence $a_{wvv^*w^*} \in R_+(Q)$.

The only conditions imposed on w in the above argument were that it end in some letter $s \ne r^*$, and that $a_w \in R_+(P)$. Such w can be chosen so as to contain any word u whatsoever as an initial segment (take, say, $w = uu^*s^*s$; the simple a_w is a P-comodule by Proposition 2.0.12). In conclusion, for any word u, $R_+(Q)$ contains some simple $a_{u\dots}$. By (1), $a_u a_u^*$ is a Q-comodule, being a summand of $a_{u\dots}(a_{u\dots})^*$. Proving this was our goal to begin with.

(2) R is a singleton $\{r\}$. In this case the duality involution $*$ is necessarily the identity, and there are only two possibilities for the fusion $\circ$: $r \circ r$ is either $\emptyset$ or r. These are precisely the fusion semirings from Examples 1.1.4 and 1.1.5 respectively, and the desired result is essentially proven in [26, 4.1, 4.7] (Wang's statements refer to the quantum groups themselves, but the proofs rely only on the structure of their fusion semirings). ■

3.0.15 Remark In the above proof, part (1) can be tweaked to get a somewhat stronger result: With the notations of the theorem, the quantum group associated to *any* Hopf subalgebra $P' \leq P$ is simple, provided among the simple comodules of P' we can find two, say a_x, a_y, for words $x, y \in \langle R \rangle$ ending in different letters. In particular, there is a rich supply of finitely generated Hopf subalgebras with simple underlying quantum groups (see 1.2.4 above). ♦

Call a quantum group with simple cocenter *projectively simple*. In view of Examples 1.1.3 and 1.1.6, free unitary groups and quantum reflection groups are all projectively simple. As noted before, this generalizes the main result of [9]. The following simple observation is of some use in determining what the cocenters of the theorem look like.

3.0.16 Proposition *Let H be a cosemisimple Hopf algebra with fusion semiring free on the data $(R, *, \circ)$. Then, the universal grading group $\mathcal{C}(H)$ is generated by R, subject to the relations turning '$*$' into the inverse and '$\circ$' into the multiplication.*

Proof Denote by G the group defined by generators and relations as in the statement (so the generators are $r \in R$ and the relations are $r^* = r^{-1}$ and $r \circ s = rs$, with the latter meaning no relation at all when $r \circ s = \emptyset$). Let $i : R \to G$ be the canonical map.

The free fusion rule (1) shows that the assignment of degree $i(r)$ to the simple $a_r \in R_+(H)$ extends by multiplication to a G-grading on the entire fusion semiring. We now have to show that this grading is initial. Indeed, given a $\tilde{G}$-grading $\deg(\bullet)$ of R for a group $\tilde{G}$, the map $r \mapsto \deg(a_r)$ on the one hand turns the involution $*$ into $g \mapsto g^{-1}$ (as noted in 2.0.9), and on the other hand, by (1), it intertwines $\circ$ and the group multiplication on $\tilde{G}$. It follows that this map factors uniquely as $i : R \to G$ followed by a group homomorphism $G \to \tilde{G}$, as desired. ■

Let's see what this says about some of the examples from §1.1.

3.0.17 Example Recall from Example 1.1.3 that the fusion semirings of the free unitary groups $A_u(Q)$ (for some positive $n \times n$ matrix Q, $n \geq 2$) are free on $R = \{\alpha, \alpha^*\}$. It follows from Proposition 3.0.16 that the grading group $\mathcal{C}(A_u(Q))$ is $\mathbb{Z}$, and hence the center is precisely the central subgroup $A_u(Q) \to \mathbb{C}[t, t^{-1}]$, $u_{ij} \mapsto \delta_{ij} t$ of [26, 4.5]. It is now a simple exercise to show that the simple comodules of the cocenter are those indexed by words in α, α^* having equal numbers of α's and α^*'s (see e.g. [9, Lemma 7]). ♦

3.0.18 Example According to Example 1.1.6, the fusion semirings $R_+(A_h^s(n))$ (for $n \geq 4$) are free on data $(\mathbb{Z}/s\mathbb{Z}, *, \circ)$ which precisely imitates the additive group structure of $\mathbb{Z}/s\mathbb{Z}$: $x^* = -x$ and $x \circ y = x + y$. Proposition 3.0.16 then implies that the center is $A_h^s(n) \to \mathbb{C}[t, t^{-1}]/(t^s = 1)$ (when $s = \infty$ there is no relation at all), defined as before by $u_{ij} \mapsto \delta_{ij} t$. The simple comodules of the cocenter are those indexed by words $r_1 \ldots r_k \in \langle \mathbb{Z}/s\mathbb{Z} \rangle$ satisfying $r_1 + \ldots + r_k = 0 \in \mathbb{Z}/s\mathbb{Z}$.

As in the previous example, the cocenter is large enough to allow, via 3.0.15, for many examples of finitely generated Hopf algebras with simple underlying compact quantum groups (at least when $s \geq 2$). ♦

3.0.19 Example When applied to Example 1.1.7, Proposition 3.0.16 shows that the universal grading group construction $\mathcal{C}(\bullet)$ preserves coproducts when applied to cosemisimple Hopf algebras *with free fusion semirings*. The phrase in italics can in fact be dropped, as we will see in the next section. ♦

4 Projective simplicity of free products

Here, we take a closer look at coproducts of cosemisimple Hopf algebras, studied in [24] and recalled above in Example 1.1.7. After giving a description of the center of such a coproduct in terms of the centers of the individual Hopf algebras (Theorem 4.0.20), we show in Theorem 4.0.23 that coproducts are automatically projectively simple (given some mild non-triviality conditions).

A note on terminology: In the sequel, 'free product' refers to quantum groups (i.e. objects dual to Hopf algebras), whereas in the dual picture, when talking about algebras or Hopf algebras, we use 'coproduct'.

To fix notation, we will be working with families H_i, $i \in I$ of cosemisimple Hopf algebras and their coproduct H in the category of Hopf algebras (or equivalently algebras, or $*$-algebras, or CQG algebras, etc.; all of these notions coincide when they make sense for the objects in question).

The fusion semiring of H is essentially described in [24]: The simples in $\mathcal{M}^H$ are the tensor products $V_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes V_n$ for all finite strings $(i_1, \ldots, i_n)$ of elements from I such that $i_k \neq i_{k+1}$, $\forall k$ and all choices of non-trivial simples $V_k \in \mathcal{M}^{H_{i_k}}$. The fusion rules are just the obvious ones; as mentioned in Example 1.1.7, the way to say all of this briefly is that the canonical inclusions $\iota_i : R_+(H_i) \to R_+(H)$ make the right hand side the coproduct of the $R_+(H_i)$'s in the category of semirings.

To be a bit more explicit about the fusion rules, write the generic simple of $\widehat{H} \subset R_+(H)$ as $z = x_1 \ldots x_n$ (same notation as above). Then, when computing its product with another such element, say $z' = y_1 \ldots y_\ell$ ($y_k \in \widehat{H_{j_k}}$), three cases can occur:

(1) If $i_n \neq j_1$, then zz' is simply the stringing together of the x's and y's.

(2) If $i_n = j_1$ but x_{i_n} is not the dual of y_{j_1}, then

$$zz' = \sum_k n_k \; x_1 \ldots x_{n-1} v_k y_2 \ldots y_\ell, \tag{6}$$

where

$$x_n y_1 = \sum_k n_k v_k, \quad n_k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \quad v_k \in \widehat{H_{i_n}}.$$

(3) Finally, if $x_n = y_1^*$ and

$$x_n y_1 = 1 + \sum_k n_k v_k$$

in $R_+(H_{i_n})$, then the product can be computed by recursion, with

$$zz' = (x_1 \ldots x_{n-1})(y_2 \ldots y_\ell) + \sum_k n_k \; x_1 \ldots x_{n-1} v_k y_2 \ldots y_\ell \tag{7}$$

as the first step of that recursion.

This discussion will be implicit throughout the entire section, and we will use the same notation and setup repeatedly. We also reprise the notation $x \mapsto a_x$ for the correspondence between words and simples, when we want to distinguish between concatenation of words and products in fusion semirings.

4.0.20 Theorem *Let H_i, $i \in I$ be a set of cosemisimple Hopf algebras, and $H = \coprod_i H_i$ their coproduct. The canonical inclusions $R_+(H_i) \to R_+(H)$ induce homomorphisms $\mathcal{C}(H_i) \to \mathcal{C}(H)$ making the universal grading group of H the coproduct of the groups $\mathcal{C}(H_i)$.*

Proof The first statement, about $H_i \to H$ descending to a morphism at the level of grading groups, follows from the fact that (being the canonical map of H_i into its coproduct with another algebra) it is an injection. This means in particular that simples of H_i remain simple over H, and hence the universal $\mathcal{C}(H)$-grading on $R_+(H)$ induces a grading on $R_+(H_i)$. Such a grading factors through a unique map from the universal grading group of H_i to that of H by the universality property of $\mathcal{C}(H_i)$. Putting all such maps together, we get a group homomorphism $\phi : \coprod \mathcal{C}(H_i) \to \mathcal{C}(H)$.

The above description of $R_+(H)$ as a coproduct implies that the individual G_i-gradings of $R_+(H_i)$ can be lifted to a grading of $R_+(H)$ by the coproduct G of the G_i's in the category of groups: Simply declare that the degree of the typical simple $x_1 \dots x_n$ is the product of the degrees of the x_k's. Moreover, this induces, as before, maps $G_i \to G$ at the level of grading groups, which are nothing but the canonical inclusions into the coproduct.

In particular, we can apply the previous paragraph to the universal gradings by $G_i = \mathcal{C}(H_i)$. By the universality of $\mathcal{C}(H)$, the coproduct inclusions $G_i \to G$ factor as $G_i \to \mathcal{C}(H) \to G$, the left hand arrow being the map from the first paragraph of the proof; in other words, the identity on G factors through $\phi : G \to \mathcal{C}(H)$, which must then be injective. On the other hand, surjectivity follows from the fact that every simple of H is a tensor product of simples of the H_i's and the description of universal grading groups mentioned after 2.0.8. ■

4.0.21 Remark What the proof shows, in fact, is the stronger statement that the universal grading group of a coproduct of fusion rings in the sense of [14] (where the term is used differently) is the coproduct of the individual universal grading groups. ♦

4.0.22 Remark The result can be regarded as a "free" analogue of the fact that taking the center of product of groups is the product of the individual centers. ♦

The next result says that free products provide a rich supply of simple quantum groups by the same natural cocenter construction.

4.0.23 Theorem *Let H_i, $i \in I$ be a family of at least two non-trivial cosemisimple Hopf algebras, and $H = \coprod H_i$ their coproduct. The quantum group correpsonding to H is projectively simple.*

Before going into the proof, let us record some consequences. The following one is immediate:

4.0.24 Corollary *The free product of at least two non-trivial, centerless, linearly reductive quantum groups is simple.* ■

4.0.25 Remark The corollary refers to the notion of simplicity from 1.2.3. A moment's thought, however, should convince the reader that the result remains true if one adopts the definition [26, 3.3], provided we restrict ourselves to free products of finite families, if we insist on the finite generation of our Hopf algebras (see 1.2.4 above or [9, Remark 5] for a comparison). ♦

4.0.26 Corollary *For H_i and H as in the statement of Theorem 4.0.23, any proper normal quantum subgroup of H is central.*

Proof Passing to the quotient by such a normal quantum subgroup, the statement can be rephrased as saying that any non-trivial ad-invariant Hopf subalgebra $\iota : Q \to H$ contains the cocenter $P \le H$.

If Q intersects the cocenter non-trivially, the intersection (being ad-invariant in P) must equal P by Theorem 4.0.23. Let us now assume that not all H_j's are group algebras (or there is nothing to prove). I claim that in this case, $P \cap Q$ is non-trivial, and hence we are in the situation we've already covered.

To prove the claim, first suppose some H_i, $I \ni i \neq i_1$ has a simple comodule y of dimension greater than 1, and let $z = x_1 \dots x_n \in \widehat{Q}$ with $x_k \in H_{i_k}$. Acting on C_z by C_y via the left adjoint action will produce elements of matrix coalgebras associated with simple comodules of the form $y \dots$ (i.e. words on $\cup\widehat{H_j}$ starting with y), some of which are non-zero by 1.2.2. It follows that Q has some simple $z' = y \dots$ of dimension greater than 1 (because $\dim y > 1$), and $z'(z')^* \in R_+(Q) \cap R_+(P)$ will then contain some non-trivial summand.

The only case left to treat is that when all H_i are group algebras except for H_{i_1}. This is easily reduced to the previous case by first acting on C_z by some non-trivial grouplike x in an H_i, $i \neq i_1$, and then applying the previous discussion to the resulting simple $x \dots$, whose underlying matrix coalgebra can now be acted upon by C_y for some simple $y \in \widehat{H_{i_1}}$ of dimension at least 2. ■

Proof of Theorem 4.0.23 Let $P \leq H$ be the cocenter of H, and $Q \leq P$ a non-trivial ad-invariant Hopf subalgebra. Our task is to show that in fact $Q = P$. It is implicit here that P is non-trivial, i.e. H_i are not all group algebras (otherwise there would be nothing to prove). We use the same notation as before for simple comodules of H, regarding them as words on the alphabet $\bigcup \widehat{H_i}$. So an expression such as $\dots x$, $x \in \widehat{H_i}$ means word ending with $1 \neq x \in \widehat{H}$. We might also refer to such a word simply as ending in $\widehat{H_i}$ (and similarly for 'starting' instead of 'ending').

(Step 1) For any simple $u = u_1 \dots u_n \in \widehat{H}$ with $u_k \in \widehat{H_{i_k}}$, P has a simple $u_1 \dots u_n \dots$ having u as an initial segment and u^* as a final segment. Indeed, if at least one H_j, $j \neq i_n$ is not a group algebra, the word uyu^* for some non-trivial simple y of the cocenter of H_j will do. Otherwise (in other words, if every H_j, $j \in I$ is a group algebra except for H_{i_n}), let y be a non-trivial simple of the cocenter of H_{i_n} and x a non-trivial simple of some H_j, $j \neq i_n$, and consider the word $uxyx^*u^*$ instead.

(Step 2) Q has a non-trivial simple simple starting and ending in the same $\widehat{H_i}$. To see this, let $z = x_1 \dots x_n \in \widehat{Q}$ be an arbitrary word, with $1 \neq x_k \in \widehat{H_{i_k}}$, and assume without loss of generality that $i_1 \neq i_n$ (or we would be done). If $|I| \geq 3$, acting on C_z by C_v for some $v \in \widehat{P}$ starting in H_i, $i \neq i_1, i_n$ will do the trick, in the now-familiar fashion (such a v exists by Step 1). So we are reduced to $I = \{1, 2\}$.

Furthermore, by the fusion rules (6) and (7), the only way in which $a_z a_z^* \in R_+(Q)$ could fail to have some non-trivial summand would be for the letters of z to all correspond to one-dimensional comodules of the various H_i's. So the interesting case is the one when all x_i's are one-dimensional.

We may now assume without loss of generality that H_{i_n} is not a group algebra (since $\{i_1, i_n\} = \{1, 2\}$), and in particular, that there is some non-trivial $y \in \widehat{H_{i_n}}$, $y \neq x_{i_n}^*$. Now act on C_z with C_v for some $v = y \dots y^* \in \widehat{P}$ (Step 1 again) to obtain some word in $\widehat{Q}$ starting in y and ending in y^*.

(Step 3) Same as Step 1, with Q instead of P. Let $1 \neq z\widehat{Q}$ be as in Step 2, starting and ending in the same $\widehat{H_i}$, and $v = u \dots u^* \in \widehat{P}$ a simple as in Step 1, with $u = u_1 \dots u_n$, $u_k \in \widehat{H_{i_k}}$. If $i \neq i_1$, then acting on $C_z \leq Q$ via the left adjoint action with elements of C_v we get elements (some non-zero, according to 1.2.2) of the coalgebra C_{vzv^*} associated to a simple of the desired form. Otherwise, i.e. if z does start in $\widehat{H_{i_1}}$, then first act on C_z with $C_{v'}$ for some $v' = u' \dots (u')^* \in \widehat{P}$ with u' not starting in H_{i_1}, and then act further on $C_{v'z(v')^*}$ with C_v. In both cases, ad-invariance ensures that C_{vzv^*} or, respectively, $C_{vv'z(vv')^*}$ is contained in Q.

(Step 4: End of the proof) Let u be an arbitrary word on $\bigcup \widehat{H_i}$. According to the previous step, we can find a simple comodule $z = u \dots \in \widehat{Q}$. The product $a_z a_z^*$ in $R_+(Q)$ majorizes $a_u a_u^*$, and hence $R_+(Q)$ contains $a_u a_u^*$ for any $u \in \widehat{H}$. The conclusion follows from Proposition 2.0.12 (b). ■

Finally, let us end by noting that most examples of simple quantum groups provided by Theorem 4.0.23 and in the previous section are far from being classical in yet another way: They lack what Wang calls property F, which demands that Hopf subalgebras be ad-invariant automatically (this is equivalent to [26, 3.6]). For a free product H of at least two non-trivial quantum groups H_i, $i \in I$, for instance, the cocenter of some non-group algebra H_i is contained in the cocenter of H, but is not ad-invariant by Theorem 4.0.23. This addresses the remark of [26, §5] to the effect that all examples of simple compact quantum groups presented there have property F.

References

[1] N. Andruskiewitsch and J. Devoto. Extensions of Hopf algebras. *Algebra i Analiz*, 7(1):22–61, 1995.

[2] Teodor Banica. Théorie des représentations du groupe quantique compact libre O(n). *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 322(3):241–244, 1996.

[3] Teodor Banica. Le groupe quantique compact libre U(n). *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 190(1):143–172, 1997.

[4] Teodor Banica. Symmetries of a generic coaction. *Math. Ann.*, 314(4):763–780, 1999.

[5] Teodor Banica and Roland Vergnioux. Fusion rules for quantum reflection groups. *J. Noncommut. Geom.*, 3(3):327–359, 2009.

[6] Hellmut Baumgärtel and Fernando Lledó. Duality of compact groups and Hilbert C^*-systems for C^*-algebras with a nontrivial center. *Internat. J. Math.*, 15(8):759–812, 2004.

[7] Vyjayanthi Chari and Andrew Pressley. *A guide to quantum groups*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995. Corrected reprint of the 1994 original.

[8] A. Chirvasitu. Cosemisimple Hopf algebras are faithfully flat over Hopf subalgebras. *ArXiv e-prints*, October 2011.

[9] Alexandru Chirvasitu. Free unitary groups are (almost) simple. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 53(12):123509, 2012.

[10] Sorin Dăscălescu, Constantin Năstăsescu, and Şerban Raianu. *Hopf algebras*, volume 235 of *Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, 2001. An introduction.

[11] Mathijs S. Dijkhuizen and Tom H. Koornwinder. CQG algebras: a direct algebraic approach to compact quantum groups. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 32(4):315–330, 1994.

[12] V. G. Drinfeld. Quantum groups. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. 1, 2 (Berkeley, Calif., 1986)*, pages 798–820, Providence, RI, 1987. Amer. Math. Soc.

[13] Pavel Etingof, Dmitri Nikshych, and Viktor Ostrik. On fusion categories. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 162(2):581–642, 2005.

[14] Shlomo Gelaki and Dmitri Nikshych. Nilpotent fusion categories. *Adv. Math.*, 217(3):1053–1071, 2008.

[15] Michio Jimbo. A q-difference analogue of $U(\mathfrak{g})$ and the Yang-Baxter equation. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 10(1):63–69, 1985.

[16] Anatoli Klimyk and Konrad Schmüdgen. *Quantum groups and their representations.* Texts and Monographs in Physics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997.

[17] Johan Kustermans and Lars Tuset. A survey of C^*-algebraic quantum groups. I. *Irish Math. Soc. Bull.*, (43):8–63, 1999.

[18] Yu. I. Manin. *Quantum groups and noncommutative geometry.* Université de Montréal Centre de Recherches Mathématiques, Montreal, QC, 1988.

[19] Susan Montgomery. *Hopf algebras and their actions on rings*, volume 82 of *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics.* Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC, 1993.

[20] Michael Müger. On the center of a compact group. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, (51):2751–2756, 2004.

[21] Sven Raum. Isomorphisms and fusion rules of orthogonal free quantum groups and their free complexifications. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 140(9):3207–3218, 2012.

[22] N. Yu. Reshetikhin, L. A. Takhtadzhyan, and L. D. Faddeev. Quantization of Lie groups and Lie algebras. *Algebra i Analiz*, 1(1):178–206, 1989.

[23] Alfons Van Daele and Shuzhou Wang. Universal quantum groups. *Internat. J. Math.*, 7(2):255–263, 1996.

[24] Shuzhou Wang. Free products of compact quantum groups. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 167(3):671–692, 1995.

[25] Shuzhou Wang. Quantum symmetry groups of finite spaces. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 195(1):195–211, 1998.

[26] Shuzhou Wang. Simple compact quantum groups. I. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 256(10):3313–3341, 2009.

[27] S. L. Woronowicz. Compact matrix pseudogroups. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 111(4):613–665, 1987.

[28] S. L. Woronowicz. Compact quantum groups. In *Symétries quantiques (Les Houches, 1995)*, pages 845–884. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1998.